

assisted by the Foundation is the study by Dr. John Bowlby and others at the Child Guidance Department of the Tavistock Clinic, London, of the effects upon personality development of the separation of young children from their mothers.

The guiding principle of the Foundation, in accordance with the expressed desire of Mrs. Walter Graeme Ladd, the founder, is to be interested in "the architecture of ideas". This is a lofty aim, and there is no cause for wonder if some of the ideas thus assisted prove ephemeral. Taken as a whole, however, the Foundation's solid achievement in stimulating and co-ordinating good research work constitutes an impressive memorial to Mrs. Ladd's father, after whom the benefaction is named.

F. H. K. GREEN

BRITISH UNIVERSITIES THROUGH AMERICAN EYES

Higher Learning in Britain

By Prof. George F. Kneller. Pp. xii + 301. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955.) 45s. net.

IT is obvious from what has been revealed in this volume", writes Prof. G. F. Kneller, "that the author sees a crisis, or better a critical situation, in the very intellectual substance of the writing which has appeared in the last few decades on university education *per se*." This writing, which is a native diagnosis of the British university system, Prof. Kneller does not commend. After an intensive examination of the literature on the "crisis", he finds it "impoverished and rapid", with "thinly-sown ideas", "worn-out and threadbare documentation" and based on "trite and nugatory educational fundamentals".

It is obvious that Prof. Kneller has little time for the rearguard skirmishers or the pessimists, for he regards their observations as "bickering". As an optimist who sees that "values in abundance prevail everywhere", he is obviously stimulated by the panorama of human interests and experiences in Britain that spring from the expansion of social, political and religious interests of the modern world. He sees in their interplay the very strength of the system. His sources of inspiration are basically scientific. A. N. Whitehead and (with reservations) J. D. Bernal are the stilts on which he lifts himself above despondency. His severest strictures are reserved for the purely 'arts' critic of our academic society. To him Sir Richard Livingstone is "uniformly vulnerable"; Dr. F. R. Leavis "verbally prolix", reflecting the "constricted modes of the nineteenth century"; Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys "is not only unrealistic . . . but totally impractical" and Bruce Truscot "contradicts himself". As for Sir Walter Moberly, Prof. Kneller writes, "It is rudely evident, to say the least, that Moberly did not succeed in defining the crisis in the university, but rather described one situation which might be said to involve a crisis". For the bouts of academic fisticuffs that flared up around Sir Walter Moberly, Prof. Kneller provides a ringside commentary, recording each blow with painstaking accuracy. He has, by so doing, made his point clear that the real crisis in the university is "in the very intellectual substance of

the writing which has appeared in the last few decades on university education *per se*".

Yet, though his sympathies are avowedly with the scientists and their claims, Prof. Kneller's ample bibliography and critical apparatus is singularly deficient on the scientific side. The *Economist* and *The Times Educational Supplement* are cited, but not *Nature*. Nor has he probed the influence of (among other bodies) the Advisory Committee on Scientific Policy, though he seems aware of its existence. Even when he does choose a scientist to adorn his story, he has to make him do the work of two. True, the present High Master of Manchester Grammar School probably can do this, but that seems no reason for giving him two separate identities in the index as "James, E. J. F., 232, 269 n. 12, 283" and "James, Eric, 92-3, 221, 257 n. 48, 261 n. 35, 283; quoted 93". This is running against the Ockhamite canon: *essentia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*. Evidently the necessity was too great.

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

MEYRICK'S MICROLEPIDOPTERA

Catalogue of the Type Specimens of Microlepidoptera

In the British Museum (Natural History) described by Edward Meyrick. By J. F. Gates Clarke.

Vol. 1. Pp. vii + 332 + 4 plates. 60s.

Vol. 2: Stenomidae, Xyloryctidae, Copromorphidae. Pp. iv + 531 (263 plates). 120s.

(London: British Museum (Natural History), 1955.)

THE first of these volumes introduces the reader to the peculiar problems arising from the vast number of species of Microlepidoptera described by Edward Meyrick (1854-1938). It gives an alphabetical list of the 14,199 names he gave them, and indicates the location of the type specimens. The second volume consists mainly of illustrations of the types (or newly designated lectotypes) belonging to three families, and it supplements Meyrick's original verbal descriptions with photographs of the left wings, photomicrographs of skilfully mounted preparations of the genitalia, and sometimes photographs or drawings of other structural details.

The author expects that four more volumes will be needed to cover the Meyrick types in London; he will then have laid the foundations on which detailed revisions of the classification can begin. It is indeed a herculean task which Meyrick left unfinished. For over half a century he dominated the study of these small moths. Collections from many parts of the world were submitted to him for naming and description. He described new species very methodically, but had an almost fanatical objection to the designation of types. This complete faith in verbal descriptions implied a belief that they were sufficient to distinguish new species not only from those already known, but also from those yet to be discovered. In a period when the science of entomology was rapidly advancing, his methods remained unchanged. Moths were still mounted on brass pins—now often corroded—and inadequately labelled. Wing venation was the prime character on which he based his classification, and shape, colour and markings were used in specific diagnoses. The genitalia were seldom examined, with the result that important structural differences were unobserved, and occa-